

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: SP03-091

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, favourable reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a page entitled "Version of Markings to Show Changes Made."

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-25 remain in this application. Claims 1, 8-10, 21, and 24-25 have been amended. Claims 4 and 6 have previously been cancelled. New Claim 26 has been added.

[Attached hereto is an affidavit appropriately rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection moot.]

1. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the specification is not commensurate in scope with these claims. Claims 24 and 25 have been amended to limit pore sizes to "about 5 μm " and "between about 0.5 μm and 1.0 μm ", respectively. The Examiner has indicated that such an amendment would be deemed acceptable in overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (See Office Action p.2, ¶3). Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 8 and 10 to clarify the compositional components to include "at least one of Co_3O_4 and NiO " (See Specification, p. 13, ¶41 and p. 14, ln 1).

Consequently, new Claim 26 contains limitations depending from amended Claim 8. Specifically, new dependent Claim 26 is presented to more completely clarify aspects of the invention recited in original Claim 8.

Revised: March 7, 2000

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: SP03-091

2. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 13-20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pantano et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. US2003/0054176).

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Pantano. The claimed invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 18 follows:

1. (Currently amended) A porous substrate comprising: a support; and an inorganic porous region on a surface of said support, the inorganic porous region having a surface capable of immobilizing probe molecules, the inorganic porous region having a tint and exhibits a reduced level of auto-fluorescence of at least about 15% relative to a comparable non-tinted porous substrate surface,

wherein said tint comprises at least one of Co_3O_4 or NiO , alone or in combination.

18. (Previously amended) A tool for performing biological or chemical assays, the tool comprises a non-porous support; and an inorganic porous region on a surface of said support, the inorganic porous region having a surface capable of immobilizing probe molecules, the inorganic porous region having a tint and exhibits a reduced level of auto-fluorescence of at least about 15% relative to a comparable non-tinted porous substrate surface,

wherein said tint comprises at least one of Co_3O_4 or NiO , alone or in combination.

The teachings of Pantano differ significantly from the present invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 18. The amended independent Claims 1 and 18 each recite a limitation where the tint comprises at least one of Co_3O_4 and NiO . Pantano fails to teach or suggest a tint comprising at least one of

Revised: March 7, 2000

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: SP03-091

Co₃O₄ and NiO. Instead, the Examiner asserts that Pantano teach a tinted porous region having a colorant component including a transition metal ion (Zinc; [0051]). Applicants continue to contend that any Zinc composition will not serve as a colorant when incorporated into glass. In addition, none of the references cited include these further considerations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned substantial differences between Pantano and the amended independent Claims 1 and 18 and their associated dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-26 are indicative of the patentability of the present invention.

New dependent Claim 26 is presented to more completely clarify aspects of the invention. Specifically, new Claim 26 depends from amended Claim 8 and contains limitations previously recited in original Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or disclose a substrate having a tint that "includes at least one of Co₃O₄ and NiO."

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that the Pantano reference, in order to anticipate the present invention, teach or suggest all the claim limitations disclosed by the claim. The claimed invention requires the substrate of this invention have a tinted porous region that "comprises at least one of Co₃O₄ or NiO, alone or in combination" that is not taught by the Pantano reference or any of the cited references. Since amended independent Claims 1 and 18 both require this limitation, it is respectfully submitted that they are in condition for allowance. Likewise, since dependent claims all require this limitation of amended independent Claims 1 and 18, it is respectfully submitted that they too are in condition for allowance.

3. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8, 9, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over Pantano et al. (US2003/0054176) in light of Mizuno et al. (US2002/0042068). Claims 10, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over Pantano in

Revised: March 7, 2000

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: SP03-091

view of Tanner et al. (US2003/0003474). Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pantano in view of Mizuno, and further, in view of Young et al. (US 6,391,809).

Amended Claims 1-3, 5, 7-26 of the present invention all require a porous region having a tint comprising "at least one of Co_3O_4 or NiO , alone or in combination."

Applicants respectfully submit that Pantano and Mizuno, either alone or in combination, do not render amended claims 8, 9, 21, and 22 obvious. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Pantano and Mizuno references in combination must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As previously discussed, Pantano fails to recite or suggest a porous region having a tint comprising "at least one of Co_3O_4 and NiO ." Likewise, Mizuno does not teach or suggest a porous region having a tint comprising "at least one of Co_3O_4 and NiO ."

Additionally, amended Claims 11 and 12 depend from amended Claim 8 and also recite a tint comprising "at least one of Co_3O_4 and NiO ", and are therefore patentable over Pantano in view of Mizuno, further in view of Young.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pantano and Tanner, either alone or in combination, do not render amended claims 10, 24, and 25 obvious. Neither Pantano nor Tanner teach or suggest a porous region having a tint comprising "at least one of Co_3O_4 or NiO , alone or in combination."

4. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of record, Applicant believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests (re)consideration of the pending Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-26 and a prompt Notice of Allowance thereon.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Response timely. Should Applicant be in error, Applicant respectfully requests

Revised: March 7, 2000

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: SP03-091

that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Thomas R. Beall at 3921.

Respectfully submitted,

CORNING INCORPORATED

Date: _____

Thomas R. Beall
Registration No. 40,424
Corning Incorporated
Patent Department
Mail Stop SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8: I
hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

Date of Deposit

Thomas R. Beall
Name of applicant, assignee, or
Registered Representative

Signature

Date of Signature

Revised: March 7, 2000